A hierarchical technique for estimating location parameter in the presence of missing data

By SERGEY TARIMA
Department of Statistics, University of Kentucky,
Lexington, Kentucky, 40506-0027, U.S.A.
stari@ms.uky.edu

YURIY DMITRIEV
Department of Applied Mathematics and Cybernetics, Tomsk State University,
Tomsk, 634050, Russia
dmit@fpmk.tsu.ru

RICHARD KRYSCIO
Department of Statistics and Department of Biostatistics, University of Kentucky,
Lexington, Kentucky, 40506-0027, U.S.A.
kryscio@email.uky.edu

arXiv:math/0411033v1 [math.ST] 1 Nov 2004

Summary

This paper proposes a hierarchical method for estimating the location parameters of a multivariate vector in the presence of missing data. At i^{th} step of this procedure an estimate of the location parameters for non-missing components of the vector is based on combining the information in the subset of observations with the non-missing components with updated estimates of the location parameters from all subsets with even more missing components in an iterative fashion. If the variance-covariance matrix is known, then the resulting estimator is unbiased with the smallest variance provided missing data are ignorable. It is also shown that the resulting estimator based on consistent estimators of variance-covariance matrices obtains unbiasedness and the smallest variance asymptotically. This approach can also be extended to some cases of non-ignorable missing data. Applying the methodology to a data with random dropouts yields the well known Kaplan-Meier estimator.

Some key words: Parameter estimation; Missing data; Hierarchical technique for missing data

1. Introduction

Censored and missing data are unavoidable parts of many rectangular data sets. For the purposes of handling these kind of data many different approaches have been developed in recent years. Little and Rubin (2002) considered a taxonomy

of missing-data methods consisting of procedures based on completely recorded units, weighting procedures, imputation-based and model-based procedures. All these procedures can be classified into two general categories: imputational and non-imputational techniques.

The first category contains a variety of single and multiple imputation methods including mean substitution, last observation carried forward, and imputational techniques for likelihood-based approaches. Multiple Imputation (MI) (Rubin, 1987) is now the accepted standard with several statistical packages supplying easy to use software for applying this method (see, for example, procedures MI and MIANALYZE in SAS, 2002). Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) provides a flexible tool for MI. Some illustrative MCMC examples are described by Schafer (1997). Expectation Maximization algorithm (Dempster, Laird, Rubin, 1977) for maximum likelihood estimators and approximate Bayesian Bootstrap (Rubin and Schenker, 1986) for stratified samples are in this category. In addition, several authors have investigated the small sample as well as large sample properties of estimators based on multiple imputation (Barnard and Rubin, 1999).

The second category consists of non-imputational techniques with the complete case method and available case method being the most popular (Verbeke and Molenberghs, 2000). In addition considerable methodology has been constructed for obtaining maximum likelihood estimators: parameter estimation on incomplete data in general linear models (Ibrahim, 1990); pattern set mixture models (Little, 1993), including the analysis based on pattern mixture models and selection models. The analysis based on pattern mixture models is the one in which inference for a function of the location parameters is obtained by combining in some weighted fashion estimates obtained from each pattern of missing components observed in the data (Molenberghs, Michiels, Kenward, Diggle, 1998). Pattern mixture models are the closest analogues to the technique proposed in this paper, but the proposed method does not depend on assuming a parametric family.

To develop a new distribution free non-imputation approach for estimation on missing data we reviewed some methods proposed and developed for involving auxiliary information in statistical function estimation. One important method due to Pugachev (1973) is the method of correlated processes which uses correlation effect between auxiliary information and empirical data for incorporating auxiliary information in statistical estimation. This method was later developed and extended by Gal'chenko and Gurevich (1991) who incorporated the estimators from previous experiments into the current estimator. The estimators obtained by these approaches provide smaller or asymptotically smaller variances than the variance of the current estimator. The further extension which is the subject of this paper provides a methodological basis for statistical estimation for missing data.

This new method is introduced in Section 2 and the asymptotic properties of this method are then derived in Appendix. Applications to the situation where missing data is due to right censoring is considered in Section 3 and shows that in this important special case the method produces the well known Kaplan-Meier estimator. The other applications to samples from a bivariate random variable with ignorable and a special case of non-ignorable missing data are presented in Section 4. In this section considered the vector of means estimation at general pattern of ignorable missing data and change score estimation at

random dropout. Conclusions are stated in Section 5.

2. Methodology

2.1. Notation

Suppose $\mathbf{X}_1, ..., \mathbf{X}_N$ are independent and identically distributed random vectors with common probability distribution $P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{R}^Q$, N and Q are finite and strictly positive integers. But $\mathbf{X}_1, ..., \mathbf{X}_N$ are not observed directly. These data are subject to a missing data mechanism by corresponding vectors indicating nonresponse: $\mathbf{R}_1, ..., \mathbf{R}_N$. Here $\mathbf{R}_n = (R_{n1}, ..., R_{nQ})$ and $R_{nq} \in \{0, 1\}$, $n = 1, ..., N$, $q = 1, ..., Q$. In the notation $R_{nq} = 1$ indicates response and $R_{nq} = 0$ indicates non-response. What is really observed is a random vector $\mathbf{Y}_1, ..., \mathbf{Y}_N$, where $\mathbf{Y}_n = (Y_{n1}, ..., Y_{nQ})$, $Y_{nq} = X_{nq}$ if $R_{nq} = 0$ and Y_{nq} is missing if $R_{nq} = 1$, $n = 1, ..., N$, $q = 1, ..., Q$.

Let $\Theta = (\theta_1, ..., \theta_S)$ take values in $\mathcal{R}^S$, where $\theta_s = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \varphi_s(\mathbf{x}) dP_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})$ with $\varphi_s(\mathbf{x})$ a known function defined on $\mathcal{R}^Q$, $\theta_s \in \mathcal{R}$, $s = 1, ..., S$.

Several examples of $\varphi_s(\mathbf{x}) = \varphi_s(x_1, ..., x_Q)$ follow.

In this paper the location parameter estimation is emphasized. If $\varphi_s(x_1, ..., x_Q) = x_1$, then θ_s is a mean of x_1. If $\varphi_s(x_1, ..., x_Q)$ is an indicator function of some event defined by the variables $x_1, ..., x_Q$, then the parameter θ_s becomes the probability of this event. Hence, a Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) can be estimated. The obtained CDF estimator can further be used to estimate percentiles, median, interquartile range, and many other parameters.

This approach is not restricted only to location parameter estimation. If $\varphi_s(x_1, ..., x_Q) = x_1 x_Q$ then θ_s is a mixed moment of x_1 and x_Q. In general, we are not excluding from consideration the possibility of more intricate forms for $\varphi_s(x_1, ..., x_Q)$, for example $\varphi_s(x_1, ..., x_Q) = x_Q \log(x_1 x_2)$.

Though the location parameter estimation is the main objective of this paper, the methodology presented in this section accommodates all these cases.

First, consider an ignorable mechanism of missing data generation. The idea of how to apply this approach to non-ignorable missing data is considered in subsection 2.4 with a special case in Section 4.

2.2. Hierarchical structure

Let R_{ij} denote an indicator vector having exactly $(i-1)$ zeros for $i = 1, ..., Q$. For a given i we have $j = 1, ..., \binom{Q}{i}$ different patterns with exactly $(i-1)$ zeros. Let J_{ij} denote the subsample size for the i^{th} level and the j^{th} pattern, where $J_{ij} \geq 0$. Let Θ_{ij} denote the subset of the S parameters $\theta_1, ..., \theta_S$ which is estimable using only the observations having the missing pattern defined by R_{ij}. Let $\hat{\Theta}_{ij}$ denote this sample estimate assuming that $J_{ij} \geq 0$. Notice that the $R's$ and corresponding estimates can be arranged into a hierarchical structure as i increases.

Example. If $Q = 3$, then this hierarchical structure follows.

- the subsample which contains complete observations defines the first level or root level ($i = 1$) and corresponds to the indicator vector (1,1,1);
- up to three subsamples define the second level ($i = 2$) and correspond to the three missing patterns $(1, 1, 0)$, $(1, 0, 1)$, and $(0, 1, 1)$;
- up to three subsamples define the third level ($i = 3$) and correspond to the three missing patterns $(1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$, and $(0, 0, 1)$.

We now use this hierarchy to improve the estimator $\hat{\Theta}_{ij}$ by using the information about the unknown value of Θ_{ij} from the next higher level. The improved estimator is

$$\tilde{\Theta}_{ij} = \hat{\Theta}_{ij} - \mathbf{K}_{ij} \left(\mathbf{K}^*_{ij}\right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}\right). \tag{1}$$

The elements of the $\mathbf{K}$ matrices and $\mathcal{B}$ vectors in equation (1) are defined below. Assume there are $S^* \equiv S(i, j)$ elements in Θ_{ij} and without loss of generality assume these are numbered $1, ..., S^*$. That is, assume, $\Theta_{ij} = (\theta_1, ..., \theta_{S^*})$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij} = \left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij1}, ..., \hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ijS^*}\right)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij} = \left(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij1}, ..., \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ijS^*}\right)$. To define these vectors let $\mathcal{B}_{ijk}$ represent the subvector of Θ_{ij} with its k^{th} component missing for $k = 1, ..., S^*$. Two estimates of $\mathcal{B}_{ijk}$ are computed from the data. The first is based on the subsample defined by R_{ij}; this is $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ijk}$ which is the subvector of $\hat{\Theta}_{ij}$ with its k^{th} component missing. The second is based on data collected at the $(i+1)^{st}$ level, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ijk}$. It is possible that there are no observations in the latter subsample in which case the corresponding subvector is dropped from both $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}$. The rectangular matrix $\mathbf{K}_{ij}$ is a block matrix defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{K}_{ij} = \left\| Cov\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij}, \hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ijk}\right) \right\|_{k=1,...,S^*}.$$

The square block matrix $\mathbf{K}^*_{ij}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{K}^*_{ij} = \left\| Cov\left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ijl}, \hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ijk}\right) + I_{[l=k]} Cov\left(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ijl}, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ijk}\right) \right\|_{k,l=1,...,S^*}.$$

The estimator (1) defines the estimator with a variance-covariance matrix

$$Cov\left(\tilde{\Theta}_{ij}, \tilde{\Theta}_{ij}\right) = Cov\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij}, \hat{\Theta}_{ij}\right) - \mathbf{K}_{ij} \left(\mathbf{K}^*_{ij}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{K}^T_{ij} \tag{2}$$

defining the smallest dispersion ellipsoid in a class

$$\tilde{\Theta}^{\Lambda}_{ij} = \hat{\Theta}_{ij} - \Lambda_{ij} \left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}\right) \tag{3}$$

with respect to different choices of the matrix Λ_{ij} of proper dimensions. The estimators $\tilde{\Theta}^{\Lambda}_{ij}$ define a class of unbiased estimators of Θ_{ij}.

In practice the true values of $\mathbf{K}_{ij}$, $\mathbf{K}^*_{ij}$ and $Cov\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij}, \hat{\Theta}_{ij}\right)$ usually are not available, in which case their consistent estimators $\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}$, $\hat{\mathbf{K}}^*_{ij}$, and $\widehat{Cov}\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij}, \hat{\Theta}_{ij}\right)$ are used instead.

This substitution modifies (1) and (2) to the following equations

$$\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}_{ij} = \hat{\Theta}_{ij} - \hat{\mathbf{K}}_{ij} \left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}^*_{ij}\right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij} - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}\right) \tag{4}$$

with

$$\widehat{Cov}\left(\tilde{\Theta}_{ij},\tilde{\Theta}_{ij}\right)=\widehat{Cov}\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij},\hat{\Theta}_{ij}\right)-\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}\left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}^{*}\right)^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}^{T}. \tag{5}$$

In addition to $det\left(\mathbf{K}_{ij}^{*}\right)>0$ a new requirement comes from (4) and (5): $\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}^{*}$ should be positive definite. From $det\left(\mathbf{K}_{ij}^{*}\right)>0$ conclude that there exists a sufficiently large sample size N such that for any $n>N$ have $det\left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{ij}^{*}\right)>0$ with probability one.

2.3. Assumptions

In order to obtain the unbiased estimator defined by (1) with the smallest dispersion ellipsoid defined by (2) we need (for every ij-subsample):

- to know K_{ij}^{*} and it should be positive definite,
- to know K_{ij} (in many cases K_{ij} consists of the elements of K_{ij}^{*}),
- $E\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij}\right)=\Theta_{ij}$, and
- $E\left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}\right)=E\left(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}\right)=\mathcal{B}_{ij}$.

When K_{ij}^{*} and K_{ij} are not known their consistent estimators provide unbiasedness and the smallest dispersion asymptotically.

According to Little and Rubin (2002, p. 119) a missing-data mechanism is ignorable if (1) the missing data are missing at random and (2) parameters managing X and R are distinct that is in different parameter spaces.

In case of ignorable missing data the missing data mechanism splitting the original sample into subsamples is independent from vector Θ.

Hence, the methodology proposed in Section 2.2 can be applied to ignorable missing data.

2.4. Adjustment for non-ignorable missing data mechanism

What does happen when missing-data mechanism is not ignorable? In this case it is reasonable to assume that some or all of S^{*} components of the vector $E\left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}\right)$ differ from these of $E\left(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}\right)$. In the other words the bias was brought by missing data.

Suppose that missing data mechanism is managed not only by parameters which are distinct from Θ_{ij} but also by W parameters which are defined in a parameter space of Θ_{ij} . If $W<S^{*}$, then it can be expected that there exist $S^{*}-W$ parameters independent from the missing data mechanism and they can be used as a components of the vectors $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij}$.

Hence, the purpose is **to find the parameters independent from the missing data mechanism**. And use these in formulas (1),(2),(4) and (5). Example of such a case is considered in Section 4.

In order to illustrate applicability of the methodology described in the section consider the following special case.

3. Random Dropout

Right censored data is one of the most common problems statisticians face. This problem can be formulated in terms of missing data with monotone missing data structure.

Suppose $X_1, \ldots, X_N$ are independent and identically distributed random variables with an unknown cumulative distribution function $F(t)$, $t \in [0, \infty)$. But $X_1, \ldots, X_N$ are not observed directly since some are distorted by $M_1, ..., M_N$ generated by a random missing mechanism. The observed sample is $Y_1, \ldots, Y_N$, where $Y_n = X_n$ if $M_n \geq X_n$ and $Y_n = M_n$ otherwise, $n \in \{1, ..., N\}$.

Assume the observed events occur at $t_1 < ... < t_S$, where $S \leq N$. Consider an arbitrary event time t_s. On the basis of complete (not censored at or before t_s) observations the empirical estimators $\hat{F}(t_s)$ and $\hat{F}(t_{s-1})$ can be calculated. In addition to these estimators an estimator $\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})$ was obtained on the basis of the data independent from complete observations. At $s = 2$ the estimator $\tilde{F}(t_1)$ uses only the observations censored at t_2. But at an arbitrary s^{th} step $\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})$ represents an estimator absorbing information from all previously censored observations. We will not need to define its form explicitly because in a recursive approach considered below we use the estimator $\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})$ absorbing information from $\hat{F}(t_{s-1})$ and $\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})$.

From we (1) obtain the following equation

$$\tilde{F}^0(t_s) = \hat{F}(t_s) - \frac{Cov\left(\hat{F}(t_s), \hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right) + Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right)} \left[\hat{F}(t_{s-1}) - \tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right]. \quad (6)$$

Considering the class of unbiased estimators

$$\tilde{F}^\lambda(t_{s-1}) = \hat{F}(t_{s-1}) - \lambda \left[\hat{F}(t_{s-1}) - \tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right],$$

the estimator

$$\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1}) = \hat{F}(t_{s-1}) - \frac{Var\left(\hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right) + Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right)} \left[\hat{F}(t_{s-1}) - \tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right] \quad (7)$$

provides the smallest variance

$$Var\left(\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})\right) = \frac{Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right) Var\left(\hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right) + Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right)}. \quad (8)$$

The estimator (7) can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1}) = \hat{F}(t_{s-1}) \frac{Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right) + Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right)}$$

$$+\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\frac{Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)+Var\left(\tilde{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}. \tag{9}$$

From (8) we have

$$Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right)=\frac{Var\left(\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})\right)Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)-Var\left(\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})\right)}. \tag{10}$$

It is interesting to see that from (10) we can write

$$\left(Var\left(\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})\right)\right)^{-1}=\left(Var\left(\hat{F}(t_{s-1})\right)\right)^{-1}+\left(Var\left(\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})\right)\right)^{-1},$$

which shows that Fisher information in $\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})$ is a sum of the Fisher information in $\hat{F}(t_{s-1})$ and in $\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})$.

Substituting (10) into (9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})=\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})&\frac{Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)-Var\left(\tilde{F}^0\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}\\ -\hat{F}(t_{s-1})&\frac{Var\left(\tilde{F}^0\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)-Var\left(\tilde{F}^0\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Applying the representation (11) of $\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})$ to the equation $\tilde{F}^0(t_s)$ have

$$\tilde{F}^0(t_s)=\hat{F}(t_s)-\frac{Cov\left(\hat{F}\left(t_s\right),\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}{Var\left(\hat{F}\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right)}\left[\hat{F}(t_{s-1})-\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})\right]. \tag{12}$$

Neither $\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})$ nor its variance appear in (12) since the $\tilde{F}^0(t_{s-1})$ and its variance absorb all information brought by $\tilde{F}(t_{s-1})$ and its variance.

Using the fact that

$$Cov(\hat{F}(t_s),\hat{F}(t_{s-1}))=\frac{F(t_{s-1})(1-F(t_s))}{n}$$

we have

$$\frac{Cov(\hat{F}(t_s),\hat{F}(t_{s-1}))}{Var(\hat{F}(t_{s-1}))}=\frac{1-F(t_s)}{1-F(t_{s-1})} \tag{13}$$

In (13) the cumulative distribution function $F(\cdot)$ is not known. Substituting its empirical estimator yields

$$\hat{\tilde{F}}^0\left(t_s\right)=\hat{F}(t_s)-\frac{1-\hat{F}(t_s)}{1-\hat{F}(t_{s-1})}\left[\hat{F}(t_{s-1})-\hat{\tilde{F}}^0\left(t_{s-1}\right)\right]$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1 - \hat{F}(t_s)}{1 - \hat{F}(t_{s-1})} \left[1 - \hat{\hat{F}}^0 (t_{s-1}) \right]. \tag{14}$$

From (14) have

$$1 - \hat{\hat{F}}^0 (t_s) = \frac{1 - \hat{F}(t_s)}{1 - \hat{F}(t_{s-1})} \left[1 - \hat{\hat{F}}^0 (t_{s-1}) \right] \tag{15}$$

The estimator $\hat{\hat{F}}^0 (t_{s-1})$ on the right side of (15) was derived by applying $\hat{F}(\cdot)$ instead of unknown $F(\cdot)$ (as it was done in (13)) on each of previous steps. Now using survival function $S(\cdot)$ instead of $1 - F(\cdot)$ the equation (15) define the well-known Kaplan-Meier estimator (Kaplan and Meier, 1958).

4. Bivariate Case

Let $\mathbf{X}_1, ..., \mathbf{X}_N$ be independent and identically distributed random variables from a bivariate distribution with a vector of means μ and a covariance matrix Σ, where $\mathbf{X}_i = \left(X_i^{(1)}, X_i^{(2)} \right)$, $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$, and $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11}^2 & \sigma_{12}^2 \\ \sigma_{12}^2 & \sigma_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix}$ is a positive definite covariance matrix.

Applying the hierarchical structure developed in Section 2 we summarize its content in the following table

Level i	Subsample j	$\mathbf{R}_{ij}$	J_{ij}	Θ_{ij}	Estimator
1	1	(1,1)	J_{11}	$(\mu_1, \mu_2)^T$	$\left(\bar{X}_{111}, \bar{X}_{112}\right)^T$
2	1	(1,0)	J_{21}	μ_1	$\bar{X}_{211}$
2	2	(0,1)	J_{22}	μ_2	$\bar{X}_{222}$

The estimator of the vector $(\mu_1, \mu_2)^T$ which uses all information in the sample becomes

$$(\tilde{\mu}_1, \tilde{\mu}_2)^T = \left(\bar{X}_{111}, \bar{X}_{112}\right)^T - \Lambda_0 \left(\bar{X}_{111} - \bar{X}_{211}, \bar{X}_{112} - \bar{X}_{222}\right)^T \tag{16}$$

where

$$\Lambda_0 = J_{11}^{-1} \left(\sigma_{11}^2, \sigma_{22}^2\right) \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11}^2 \left(1 + \frac{J_{11}}{J_{21}}\right) & \sigma_{12}^2 \\ \sigma_{12}^2 & \sigma_{22}^2 \left(1 + \frac{J_{11}}{J_{22}}\right) \end{pmatrix}^{-1}. \tag{17}$$

In a case when covariances in (17) are known the estimator (16) will be unbiased with the smallest variance in class (3). If these covariances are not known then their consistent estimates can be used instead and the obtained estimator will not be the optimal one anymore but it will converge to (16) in distribution (see proposition 2 in Appendix).

An **important special case** is $J_{22} = 0$. We discuss this problem next.

4.1. Change Score Estimation

Let $\delta = \mu_1 - \mu_2$ be the change score we need to estimate. This difference can be estimated with complete observations: $\hat{\delta} = \bar{X}_{111} - \bar{X}_{112}$.

The estimator (1) takes the following form

$$\tilde{\delta} = \hat{\delta} - \frac{J_{11}}{J_{11} + J_{21}} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{12}^2}{\sigma_{11}^2}\right) \left(\bar{X}_{111} - \bar{X}_{211}\right) \tag{18}$$

with a variance

$$Var\left(\tilde{\delta}\right) = \frac{1}{J_{11}} \left(\sigma_{11}^2 - 2\sigma_{12}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2 - \frac{J_{21}}{(J_{11} + J_{21})} \frac{\left(\sigma_{11}^2 - \sigma_{12}^2\right)^2}{\sigma_{11}^2}\right). \tag{19}$$

If $\sigma_{11}^2 = \sigma_{12}^2$ then $\tilde{\delta} = \hat{\delta}$ (the estimator based on **complete** cases).

If $\sigma_{12}^2 = 0$ then $\tilde{\delta} = \frac{J_{11}}{J_{11}+J_{21}} \bar{X}_{111} + \frac{J_{21}}{J_{11}+J_{21}} \bar{X}_{211} - \bar{X}_{112}$ (the estimator based on **available** cases).

4.2. Change Score Estimation at Compound Symmetry

Let us assume $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \sigma^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ then

$$\tilde{\delta} = \hat{\delta} - \frac{J_{11}}{J_{11} + J_{21}} (1 - \rho) \left(\bar{X}_{111} - \bar{X}_{211}\right) \tag{20}$$

with variance

$$Var\left(\tilde{\delta}\right) = \frac{\sigma^2}{J_{11}} \left(2(1 - \rho) - \frac{J_{21}}{J_{11} + J_{21}} \sigma^2 (1 - \rho)^2\right). \tag{21}$$

If $\rho = 0$ then $\tilde{\delta} = \hat{\delta} - \frac{J_{11}}{J_{11}+J_{21}} \left(\bar{X}_{111} - \bar{X}_{211}\right)$ and $Var\left(\tilde{\delta}\right) = \frac{\sigma^2}{J_{11}} \left(2 - \frac{J_{21}\sigma^2}{J_{11}+J_{21}}\right)$.

If $\rho = 1$ then $\tilde{\delta} = \hat{\delta}$ and $Var\left(\tilde{\delta}\right) = 0$.

Now we return to the case where $J_{11} > 0$, $J_{21} > 0$, and $J_{22} > 0$ but assume data are not missing at random.

4.3. Non-ignorable Missing Data

At **non-ignorable missing data** the parameters which do not change after missing data transformations should be found. Let us assume that the missing data case is the result of changed experimental conditions, for example, Δ shift appears for $X^{(1)}$ or $X^{(2)}$ if one of these components is missing. The value of the Δ is unknown.

Using only incomplete observations obtain $\tilde{\delta} = \bar{X}_{211} - \bar{X}_{222}$. In $\tilde{\delta}$ the Δ shift effect is canceled and $E\left(\tilde{\delta}\right) = E\left(\hat{\delta}\right) = \Delta$. For these estimators $Var\left(\hat{\delta}\right) = J_{11}^{-1}\left(\sigma_{11}^2 - 2\sigma_{12}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2\right)$, $Var\left(\tilde{\delta}\right) = J_{22}^{-1}\sigma_{11}^2 + J_{21}^{-1}\sigma_{22}^2$, and the estimator (1) takes the following form

$$\tilde{\delta}^{\Lambda_0} = \hat{\delta} - \frac{\sigma_{11}^2 - 2\sigma_{12}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2}{\sigma_{11}^2 \left(1 + \frac{J_{11}}{J_{21}}\right) - 2\sigma_{12}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2 \left(1 + \frac{J_{11}}{J_{22}}\right)} \left(\hat{\delta} - \tilde{\delta}\right) \tag{22}$$

with a variance

$$Var\left(\tilde{\delta}^{\Lambda_0}\right) = \frac{\sigma_{11}^2 - 2\sigma_{12}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2}{J_{11}} - \frac{\left(\sigma_{11}^2 - 2\sigma_{12}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2\right)^2}{J_{11}\left(\sigma_{11}^2\left(1 + \frac{J_{11}}{J_{21}}\right) - 2\sigma_{12}^2 + \sigma_{22}^2\left(1 + \frac{J_{11}}{J_{22}}\right)\right)}. \tag{23}$$

If the variances and covariances used in (22) and (23) are not available, then their consistent estimators can be used. According to Proposition 2 asymptotic properties continue to hold.

5. Conclusion

If only the variance-covariance structure of a considered model is known, the estimators proposed in this paper are unbiased and provide the smallest variance in a class of unbiased estimators. In the cases when one ought to estimate the parameters of variance covariance structure with consistent estimators the estimators obtain unbiasedness with the smallest variance asymptotically.

These estimators are not restricted to monotone missing data structures and can be derived from the observations with a general pattern of missing data. Despite the fact that these estimators are obtained for the case of ignorable missing data they can also be derived for some cases of non-ignorable mechanism of missing data. A special case of nonignorable missing data considered in Section 5.

This approach does not require the assumptions on parametrical families as many likelihood based methods and works when the first two moments of the underlying distribution are finite.

Assuming asymptotical normality of the estimators obtained on subsamples the final estimators obtained with proposed methodology will be asymptotically normal as well. The two propositions in Appendix provide asymptotical mean and variance for these estimators.

Many standard statistical procedures may be used with these estimators, for example, sample size determination or hypothesis testing.

It was shown in section 3 that a well-known Kaplan-Meier estimator is a result of applying this approach to right censoring data with random dropout.

Overall, the nonparametric ground, the absence of any imputations in any form, and the properties stated for finite and large sample sizes make the proposed estimator distinct from the others and applicable in many practical cases.

6. References

Barnard, J., and Rubin, D.B. Small-sample degrees of freedom with multiple imputation. *Biometrika* 86, 1999, no. 4, 948-955.

Casella, George; Berger, Roger L. Statistical inference. *Duxbury*, 2002, 660pp.

Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., Rubin, D.B. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm (with discussion). *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* B 39, 1977, 1-38.

Gal'chenko, M. V.; Gurevich, V. A. Minimum-contrast estimation taking into account additional information. *Journal of Soviet Math.*, 53, 1991, no. 6, 547-551.

Ibrahim G. Joseph. Incomplete data in generalized linear models. *J. Amer. Statist. Ass.*, Vol. 85, No. 411, 1990, 765-769.

Kaplan E. L., P. Meier, Nonparametric estimator from incomplete observations. *J. Amer. Statist. Ass.*, 53, 1958, 457-481.

Kulldorff, Gunnar. Contribution to the Theory of Estimation from Grouped and Partially Grouped Samples. *Almqvist & Wiksell*, Stockholm, 1961, pp. 142.
Little, R.J.A. Pattern-mixture models for multivariate incomplete data. *J. Amer. Statist. Ass.*, 88, 1993, 125-134.

Little, R.J.A. and Rubin, D.B. Statistical Analysis with missing data. *New York, Wiley-Interscience*, 2002

Molenberghs, G., Michiels, B., Kenward, M.G., and Diggle, P.J. Missing data mechanisms and pattern-mixture models. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 52, 1998, 153-161.

Pugachev, V. N. Mixed Methods of Determining Probabilistic Characteristics. [in Russian] *Moscow, Soviet Radio*, 1973, 256pp.

Rubin, D.B. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63, 1976, no. 3, 581-592.

Rubin, D.B. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. *New York, Wiley*, 1987.

Rubin, D.B., Schenker, N. Multiple imputation for interval estimation from simple random samples with ignorable nonresponse *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 81, 1986, 366-374.

Schafer, J.L., Analysis of incomplete multivariate data. London, *Chapman & Hall*, 1997.
SAS/STAT User's Guide, Vol. 2, Cary, NC, *SAS Institute Inc.*, 2002.

Verbeke, G., Molenberghs, G. Linear mixed models for longitudinal data. New York, *Springer*, 2000.

Zhang, B. Confidence intervals for a distribution function in the presence of auxiliary information. *Computational statistics and data analysis*, v.21, 1996, pp 327-342.

Appendix: Large Sample Properties

If $\mathbf{K}_{ij}$, $\mathbf{K}_{ij}^{*}$ and $Cov\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij},\hat{\Theta}_{ij}\right)$ are known and there exists $\left(\mathbf{K}_{ij}^{*}\right)^{-1}$, then the estimator (1) can be calculated and the asymptotic properties of the estimator (1) described by the following result.

Proposition 1. Let us consider the vectors $\hat{\xi}_{ij}\equiv\sqrt{J_{ij}}\left(\hat{\Theta}_{ij}-\Theta_{ij}\right)$, $\hat{\psi}_{ijs}\equiv\sqrt{J_{ij}}\left(\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{ijs}-\mathcal{B}_{ijs}\right)$, $\hat{\zeta}_{ijs}\equiv\sqrt{J_{ijs}}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ijs}-\mathcal{B}_{ijs}\right)$, $s=1,...,S^{*}$ (for simplicity we omit ij-subscript in further notation) with the following properties:

1) $\hat{\xi}\longrightarrow\xi$, in distribution, as $J\rightarrow+\infty$. Also assume $E\left(\xi\right)\equiv\mathbf{0}$ and all elements composing covariance matrix $Cov\left(\xi,\xi\right)\equiv\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\xi)}$ are finite.

2) $\hat{\zeta}^{(s)}\longrightarrow\zeta^{(s)}$, in distribution, as $J_{s}\rightarrow+\infty$. Also assume $E\left(\zeta^{(s)}\right)\equiv\mathbf{0}$ and all elements composing covariance matrix $Cov\left(\zeta^{(s)},\zeta^{(s)}\right)\equiv\mathbf{C}_{ss}^{(\zeta,\zeta)}$ are finite, for all $s=1,...,S^{*}$.

3) $\hat{\psi}^{(s)}\longrightarrow\psi^{(s)}$, in distribution, as $J\rightarrow+\infty$. Also assume $E(\psi^{(s)})\equiv\mathbf{0}$ and all elements composing covariance matrices $Cov\left(\psi^{(s)},\psi^{(q)}\right)\equiv\mathbf{C}_{sq}^{(\psi,\psi)}$ and $Cov\left(\xi,\psi^{(s)}\right)\equiv\mathbf{C}_{s}^{(\xi,\psi)}$ are finite, for all $s,q=1,...,S^{*}$.

If $det\left(\mathbf{K}^{*}\right)>0$ and $\frac{\sqrt{J}}{\sqrt{J_{s}}}\longrightarrow w_{s}\in[0,+\infty)$, as J and/or J_{s} go to $+\infty$, then $\hat{\eta}\equiv\sqrt{J}\left(\hat{\Theta}-\Theta\right)$ converges to a random vector η with $E\left(\eta\right)\equiv\mathbf{0}$ and $Cov\left(\eta,\eta\right)\equiv\mathbf{C}^{(\eta,\eta)}\equiv\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\xi)}-\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\psi+\zeta)}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\right)^{T}$, where matrices $\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\zeta)}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{(\psi+\zeta)}$ are combined from the other matrices $\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\zeta)}=\|\mathbf{C}_{s}^{(\xi,\zeta)}\|_{s=1,...,S^{*}}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{(\psi+\zeta)}=\|\mathbf{C}_{sq}^{(\psi,\psi)}+I_{[s=q]}w_{s}^{2}\mathbf{C}_{ss}^{(\zeta,\zeta)}\|_{s,q=1,...,S^{*}}$.

Proof. Taking into consideration that $\hat{\Theta}$ is an unbiased estimator of Θ have $E\left(\eta\right)=\sqrt{J}\left(E\hat{\Theta}-\Theta\right)=\mathbf{0}$. Hence, $E\left(\eta\right)=\mathbf{0}$.

From (2) have $\mathbf{C}^{(\eta,\eta)}=J\left(Cov\left(\hat{\Theta},\hat{\Theta}\right)-\mathbf{K}\left(\mathbf{K}^{*}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{K}\right)^{T}\right)$.

Applying the facts

(1) $JCov\left(\hat{\Theta},\hat{\Theta}\right)$ converges to $\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\xi)}$, as J goes to $+\infty$,

(2) $\mathbf{K}\left(\mathbf{K}^{*}\right)^{-1}$ converges to $\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\psi+\zeta)}\right)^{-1}$, as $\frac{\sqrt{J}}{\sqrt{J_{s}}}$ goes to w_{s}, as J and/or J_{s} go to $+\infty$, and

(3) $J\left(\mathbf{K}\right)^{T}$ goes to $\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\right)^{T}$, as J goes to $+\infty$,

conclude $\mathbf{C}^{(\hat{\eta},\hat{\eta})}$ converges to $\mathbf{C}^{(\eta,\eta)}$. **Q.E.D.**

In the expression for $\mathbf{C}^{(\eta,\eta)}$ the term $\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\psi+\zeta)}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\right)^{T}$ consists of quadratic forms and corresponds to the decrease of the original dispersion ellipsoid. Applying different quadratic forms (defined by risk function) to $\mathbf{C}^{(\eta,\eta)}$ the term $\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\psi+\zeta)}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{C}^{(\xi,\psi)}\right)^{T}$ defines different non-negative numbers showing asymptotic improvement of used risk function.

In the Proposition 1 the cases when there exists $w_{s}=+\infty$ were not considered because as only $w_{s}=+\infty$ information from s^{th}-subsample on $(i+1)$ level is overwhelmed by information in ij-subsample and cannot improve the

asymptotic properties of the estimators derived from ij-subsample. In this case s^{th}-subsample on $(i+1)$ level should be excluded from consideration.

Another extreme situation appears when w_s is equal to 0 which corresponds to incorporating information of exact knowledge. In the case $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is known with zero variance.

Proposition 1 defines the asymptotic properties of the estimator (1) but this estimator cannot be used in a number of practical cases because $\mathbf{K}\left(\mathbf{K}^*\right)^{-1}$ usually is not known. In this case the estimator $\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}$, obtained in (4) by substitution $\mathbf{K}\left(\mathbf{K}^*\right)^{-1}$ on $\hat{\mathbf{K}}\left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}^*\right)^{-1}$, should be used. The asymptotic properties of $\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}$ is described as follows.

Proposition 2. Suppose the assumptions of Proposition 1 hold and every element of $J\left(\widehat{Cov}\left(\hat{\Theta},\hat{\Theta}\right)-Cov\left(\hat{\Theta},\hat{\Theta}\right)\right)$, $J\left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}-\mathbf{K}\right)$, and $J\left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}^*-\mathbf{K}^*\right)$ converges to some random variable with mean zero and finite variance.

Then $\sqrt{J}\left(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}-\Theta\right)$ converges in distribution to η, as $J\longrightarrow+\infty$, where η defined in Proposition 1.

Proof.

Notice that $\sqrt{J}\left(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}-\Theta\right)$ differs from $\sqrt{J}\left(\tilde{\Theta}-\Theta\right)$ only by applying $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{K}}^*$ instead of $\mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{K}^*$.

From the fact that linear combinations of elements of $\hat{\mathbf{K}}$ and $\left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}^*\right)^{-1}$ are continuous functions and all these elements converge in probability to their true values on the basis of Theorem 5.5.4 (Casella and Berger, 2002, p. 233) conclude $\hat{\mathbf{K}}\left(\hat{\mathbf{K}}^*\right)^{-1}$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{K}\left(\mathbf{K}^*\right)^{-1}$.

Now from Slutsky's Theorem (Casella and Berger, 2002, p. 239) conclude $\sqrt{J}\left(\hat{\tilde{\Theta}}-\Theta\right)$ converges in distribution to η. Q.E.D.

Remark: For the cases when all $w_s=0$ estimator (4) becomes the same as the estimator derived by method of correlated processes (Pugachev,1973) and has the same asymptotical properties as the empirical likelihood estimator in the presence of auxiliary information (Zhang,1996).